1 The Sources of the Gospel of John

For more than one hundred years scholars have endeavored to discover and separate the sources or literary strata believed to be embedded in the Gospel of John. Previous attempts to explain the origin of the Fourth Gospel by theories of a *Grundschrift* or literary sources and redaction, not to mention rearrangement, found their culmination and were probably superseded when, over a generation ago, Rudolf Bultmann set forth a comprehensive literary theory in his magisterial *Das Evangelium des Johannes.*[1] Bultmann's work has given a measure of unity to the subsequent discussion of the literary

1. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer, 2. Abt., 15. Aufl. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957). Bultmann's interest in the source problem of John antedates the publication of his commentary by at least two decades. He first analyzed the prologue in "Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-Evangelium," *Eucharisterion, Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* [H. Gunkel Festschrift], ed. H. Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pt. II, pp. 3–26. Later he made a source-critical study of 1 John and discovered there a discourse source similar to the one he subsequently traced through the Gospel ("Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefes," *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1927], pp. 138–58). In another early study, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangelium," *ZNW* 24 (1925): 100–46, he did important background work for the development of his discourse source theory. For a description of earlier investigations and theories see W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, rev. ed. by C. K. Barrett (London: Epworth, 1955), pp. 61ff.; also W. Bousset, "Ist das vierte Evangelium eine literarische Ein-

problem where it has been taken into account. Those who sharply disagree with Bultmann have found it a convenient benchmark by which to gain a perspective on the problems of the Gospel. His theory, worked out in most minute detail, involves the evangelist's use of sources, the presumably accidental disruption of the original textual order, and the (incorrect) restoration and editorial expansion of the text by an ecclesiastical redactor. Any discussion of recent developments in this area will naturally and appropriately begin with his work.

This article will not deal with every aspect of Bultmann's theory. I shall only attempt to indicate the influence of his source hypothesis upon subsequent investigation and discussion of the problem of the composition of the Fourth Gospel. Although the discussion which Bultmann's source theory has stimulated may have been somewhat overshadowed by the enormous interest that has been shown in other aspects of his work, it is of some importance. While it has not produced a clear solution of the problem, it has served to better define the limitations and possibilities which confront further research.

THE SOURCE THEORY OF RUDOLF BULTMANN

Aside from the work of the redactor Bultmann discerns four principal literary sources or layers in the Gospel.[2] First of all, he discovers in the prologue a *Vorlage* which the evangelist is said to have drawn from a written discourse source employed at many other points in the Gospel.[3] Bultmann refers to this source as the revelation discourses (*Offenbarungsreden*). These discourses are identified by their peculiar rhythmic structure, the Semitic cast of their language, and their mythical, Gnostic motifs. They often function as "texts" for the evangelist's own preaching, in which case both the texts and the preaching usually appear as words of Jesus.[4] The narratives of chapters 1–12, especially the miracle stories, are also said to have been drawn by the evangelist from a written source, the hypothetical *semeia*-source.[5] It is upon this source rather than the synoptic gospels that the evangelist relied for most, although not all, of his narrative material. As might be expected, the third major source comprises the passion and resurrection narratives.[6] Although this portion of the Gospel is perhaps closest to the synoptic tradition, Bultmann believes, and is able to argue persuasively, that the similarities and parallels are best accounted for on the hypothesis that John drew upon a separate source rather than upon the synoptic Gospels. A fourth and final element of the original text of the Gospel, although not a "source", is the work of the evangelist himself. This somewhat enigmatic figure is said to have been an adherent of the rival Baptist sect before he came over to Christianity, bringing with him the *Offenbarungsreden* and perhaps other Baptist tradition.[7] He is much more than a mere editor or purveyor of tradition. His literary skill and theological insight are manifest not only in the sections of the Gospel which he composed, but also in the manner in which he wove the three principal written sources and other traditional materials into a harmonious whole, making of them a vehicle for his own theological thought. Bultmann identifies the hand of the evangelist by means of contextual, stylistic, and theological criteria.[8] Although the Gospel contains certain Semitic

heit?," *ThR* 12 (1909): 1 ff., 39 ff. There is also a good review of three recent decades of Johannine research: E. Haenchen, "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium, 1929–56," *ThR*, n.s. 23 (1955): 295–335. W. G. Kümmel's excellent survey and assessment of the literature since 1940 in his revision of the Feine-Behm *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 12 Aufl. (Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1963), esp. pp. 135–49, unfortunately appeared too late to be taken into account in this essay.

2. The problem of redaction, as well as that of the dislocation and rearrangement of the text, involves the stages of development following the completion of what Bultmann regards as the original Gospel, and we shall not deal with it here. The source theory provides Bultmann's answer to the question of how the Gospel was originally composed.

In a doctoral dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty of Yale University I have attempted to make a much more extensive examination of Bultmann's work. The citation of some literature omitted here because of limitation of space was included in that volume. See *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press., 1965).

3. Ibid., p. 4 n. 5.
4. Ibid., p. 93.
5. Ibid., p. 78.
6. Ibid., pp. 489ff.
7. Ibid., p. 76.
8. The stylistic characteristics which Bultmann attributes to the evangelist include Semitisms of one sort or another, the epexegetical ἵνα-clause, the οὐ(κ) ...

features, these are to be attributed largely to the sources. Bultmann regards it as certain that the evangelist himself wrote in Greek.

THE DISCUSSION OF BULTMANN'S PROPOSAL

While Bultmann's source theory has had its effect on subsequent Johannine research, it has by no means won universal, or even wide, assent. Soon after the publication of the commentary Jeremias, Dibelius, and Menoud expressed doubts about the adequacy of the evidence for the sources.[9] Among scholars in the English-speaking world, C.H. Dodd did not take the source theory into account (the commentary was unavailable when his book was written), and C.K. Barrett, while giving it some consideration, rejected it completely.[10] On the continent Oscar Cullmann continues to go his separate and independent way, while some of Bultmann's students, among others, have their own doubts and reservations. There have been at least two systematic analyses and criticisms of Bultmann's source theory. A decade after his work was completed E. Ruckstuhl, a Swiss Catholic, published a thoroughgoing critique of both the source and redaction theories entitled *Die literarische Einheit des vierten Evangeliums*. This was followed in 1954 by another treatment of the source proposal in B. Noack's *Zur johanneischen Tradition*.[11]

ἀλλά construction, emphatic ἐκεῖνος, and other such traits often regarded as typical of the Gospel as a whole. In contexts where the *Offenbarungsreden* appear, the evangelist's prosaic style is said to distinguish his hand from the source material. Moreover, according to Bultmann, the evangelist's theological perspective often differs from that of his sources, and this fact is helpful to the perceptive source critic.

9. J. Jeremias, "Johanneische Literarkritik," *ThBl* 20 (1941): 33–46, esp. 39–43; M. Dibelius, "Ein neuer Kommentar zum Johannes-Evangelium," *TLZ* 67 (1942): 257–63; Ph.-H. Menoud, *L'Évangile de Jean d' après les recherches récentes*, Cahiers théologiques de actualité protestante 3, 2d ed. (Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1947), pp. 12–26.

10. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), p. 121 n. 2; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956). The importance of Bultmann's commentary, especially his source theory, was recognized by B. S. Easton, who reviewed the commentary and produced an English translation of the *Offenbarungsreden* source (*JBL* 65 [1946]: 73–81, 143–56).

11. Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums, Der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Forschungen*, Studia Friburgensia, n.s. 3 (Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1951), pp. 20–134, 180–219, 267 ff.; B. Noack, *Zur johanneischen Tradition, Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarkritischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1954), pp. 9–42.

Of the two, Ruckstuhl's is the most extensive and the least sympathetic. As the title implies, he really sets out to defend the literary unity of the Fourth Gospel against the onslaught of Bultmann's source and redaction analysis. The presumption is that if his carefully conceived and documented theory is untenable, the Gospel's unity must be unimpeachable. Recalling that Bultmann himself once asserted that the prime requisite for the source criticism of the Gospel was a set of suitable stylistic criteria,[12] Ruckstuhl proposes to inquire whether Bultmann has really been able to derive such criteria from the Gospel and thus convincingly support his hypothesis.

As a result of his investigation Ruckstuhl claims that Bultmann is able to bring forth an impressive set of stylistic criteria only for the evangelist. The stylistic characteristics of the sources do not distinguish themselves sufficiently from those of the evangelist and are fewer in number. This deficiency cannot be ascribed to Bultmann's negligence, for he has assiduously scoured the text for all sorts of stylistic characteristics. But he has made the methodological error of ascribing the passages with the more distinct stylistic features to the evangelist, leaving the more stylistically neutral or colorless passages to the alleged sources. Moreover, the characteristics of the evangelist are not uniquely his own, for they appear also in sections which Bultmann assigns to the sources. To ascribe such characteristics to the evangelist when they appear in the midst of a source, as Bultmann often does, is, according to Ruckstuhl, a very arbitrary procedure.[13] Futhermore, some of Bultmann's stylistic characteristics are said to indicate only differences of content—namely, narrative or discourse material—rather than real differences of style.[14]

The rhythmic criterion which Bultmann utilizes to identify the *Offenbarungsreden* is attacked by Ruckstuhl as too unstable to serve as a basis for source separations. On Bultmann's own showing the verses of the discourses are of very irregular length and rhythm. Ruckstuhl also calls attention to the fact that while the *Offenba-*

12. Ruckstuhl, p. 39. He refers to Bultmann's article in *Die christliche Welt* 41 (1927): 502–11.

13. Ruckstuhl, p. 62 n. 2. E.g., the resumptive οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος (αὐτός) occurs six times in material which Bultmann otherwise assigns to the *Offenbarungsreden*.

14. Ibid., pp. 104–6.

rungsreden rhythm sometimes seems to be deficient in the material ascribed to that source, it not infrequently appears in passages Bultmann leaves to the evangelist.[15] Ruckstuhl also casts doubt upon the significance of the evidence of narrative sources, especially the *semeia*-source, which Bultmann has adduced. The various narrative sources do not differ markedly in style, according to Ruckstuhl, and the narratives of John differ stylistically from those of the synoptics only as the Gospel as a whole differs from the synoptic gospels.[16]

As a coup de grace, Ruckstuhl employs a version of the style-statistical method developed by E. Schweizer to test the stylistic grounds for Bultmann's source separations.[17] Schweizer had compiled a list of thirty-three frequently recurring Johannine stylistic characteristics and had shown that they appear at random throughout the various hypothetical sources which Spitta, Wendt, and Hirsch had distinguished. Thus their Johannine source theories were, if not disproved, at least called into question. Ruckstuhl expands this list to fifty and, like Schweizer, finds that none occur repeatedly with

15. Ibid., pp. 43–54. Ruckstuhl contrasts the divergent rhythmic patterns found in 1:1–2; 3:8; 3:12; 8:50; 8:54a; 12:47–48; 15:2; 5:21; 15:4a; 15:5; 5:39–40; 8:12; 11:9–10; 12:49–50; 1 John 1:6–7—all of which Bultmann assigns to the *Offenbarungsreden*. Remarkable differences are indeed apparent. As Käsemann and Jeremias had already pointed out, Bultmann is not able to trace the distinct rhythmic pattern of the prologue through the speeches of the *Offenbarungsreden*. Ruckstuhl also refers to some eighty doublets in the style of the *Offenbarungsreden* which Bultmann assigns to the evangelist. As examples of these he cites 4:32, 38; 8:47; 9:41; 13: 20 (p. 48). While I agree that it is difficult to draw a sharp line between the style of the evangelist and that of the *Offenbarungsreden*, the examples which Ruckstuhl adduces from the material assigned to the evangelist are not well chosen. 13:20 is a synoptic variant which occurs in very similar form in Matt. 10:40 and Luke 10:16. Bultmann actually assigns 8:47a to the *Offenbarungsreden* rather than to the evangelist (*Johannes*, p. 245 n. 4) and suggests that a tradition may lie behind 4:38 (p. 147 n. 4). 4:32 is too brief to be very impressive. Although 9:41 may be regarded as the evangelist's application of the *Offenbarungswort* of 9:39, it is the most clear-cut instance of the style of the source in the evangelist's compositions.

16. Ruckstuhl, pp. 98–104.

17. Ibid., pp. 180–219, esp. 212–16. Cf. E. Schweizer, *Ego Eimi . . . Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums*, FRLANT, ed. R. Bultmann, n.s. 38, entire ser. 56 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), pp. 103–5.

others in well-defined patterns or groupings which would indicate the existence of corresponding sources.[18] He then proceeds to test Bultmann's source theory against this new set of criteria. The results are about as clear-cut as Schweizer's. The characteristics are scattered indiscriminately through Bultmann's sources, indicating that his theory gains as little support from this sort of testing as those of Spitta, Wendt, and Hirsch. Although Ruckstuhl's method parallels Schweizer's quite closely, his conclusions depart in a striking and significant way. Schweizer only claimed to have proved a certain stylistic unity which he thought discouraging for future attempts to identify sources behind the present text of the Gospel. He did not deny that such sources could have existed.[19] Ruckstuhl, on the other hand, regards not only Bultmann's source (and redaction) theory as disproved, but all efforts to separate sources, either already undertaken or contemplated. Even the possibility of the existence of such written sources is denied.

Aside from these rather too far-reaching conclusions, Ruckstuhl's work does not, it seems to me, do justice to Bultmann's substantial reasons for undertaking source analysis in the first place. His book leaves the impression that Bultmann's method of dealing with the Fourth Gospel is rather perverse, or uncalled for, which it is not, regardless of whether it is right or wrong. The persuasiveness of Ruckstuhl's book is indeed somewhat vitiated by his seeming reluctance to take seriously the evidence which has led many scholars to question the literary unity of the Gospel. That this conservatism is not to be attributed to his Catholicism is revealed by the criticism of his work by another Roman Catholic scholar, R. Schnackenburg.[20] Schnackenburg rightly grants the effectiveness of many of Ruckstuhl's strictures against Bultmann's position, but denies that the evidence for a marked degree of overall stylistic unity carries with it the right to make a categorical judgment against any alleged

18. Among the criteria gathered by Schweizer and Ruckstuhl are the ἵνα epexegeticum, οὐ ...ἀλλ' ἵνα, ἐκεῖνος (cf.n. 8 above), οὖν historicum, τότε οὖν, καθώς ...καί, etc. — stylistic characteristics which also figure in Bultmann's source analysis. Ruckstuhl does not, however, confine himself to the characteristics which Bultmann uses.

19. Schweizer, pp. 108ff.

20. "Logos-Hymnus und johanneischer Prolog," *BZ* 1 (1957): 69–109.

source at any point in the Gospel. Rather, he contends that the style-critical criteria must be used on specific passages to determine whether or not we may in certain cases distinguish between the hand of the evangelist and other material. Schnackenburg then supports his contention with a style-critical examination of the prologue, which offers some surprisingly strong, although not complete, support for Bultmann's reconstruction of a prologue source.[21] So while it must be conceded that Ruckstuhl has succeeded in putting a very large question mark over Bultmann's hypothesis, he has not been able to sweep the field as cleanly of source criticism as he desired. If Bultmann goes further than the evidence warrants in defining extensive sources down to the most minute detail, Ruckstuhl goes too far in concluding from a demonstrable stylistic unity of the Gospel that such sources not only cannot be proved but, in fact, never existed at all.

In his monograph Noack argues that oral traditions rather than written sources lie immediately behind the Fourth Gospel and proposes to break the text down into its smallest components in order to show this. But he realizes that before he can set forth a defensible account of his own position he must come to terms with Bultmann's literary analysis and source theory. He carefully examines a number of the stylistic characteristics which Bultmann employs as criteria for the identification of the hand of the evangelist.[22] Like Ruckstuhl, he discovers that sometimes the characteristics which Bultmann attributes to the evangelist turn up in the sources, in which case they are sometimes assigned to the evangelist, but sometimes not. Moreover, to account for stylistic similarities between the *Offenbarungsreden* and the evangelist, Bultmann claims that the latter has been influenced by the style and content of his source. But Noack maintains that such explanations only indicate that we are on very unsure footing in attempting to distinguish between source and evangelist.[23] Like Ruckstuhl, Noack points out that at some points there are far greater disparities in rhythm between different segments of the *Offenbarungsreden* source than between certain passages assigned to the source and others assigned to the evangelist. Again like Ruckstuhl, he observes that the stylistic characteristics of the evangelist are much more numerous and clearly defined than those of the source. Against the *semeia*-source Noack objects that such a document, containing stories but no sayings, is without historical precedent and that Bultmann's case for it is weakened by his inability to ascribe to it all the narratives of the Gospel. Neither does Noack believe that the enumeration of a first and second sign (2:11; 4:36) and the mention of signs in the conclusion of the gospel (20:30–31) point to the use of a *semeia*-source.[24] He argues that the narratives, like the sayings, were composed from oral tradition. The prevalence of parataxis in the narratives, like the characteristic asyndeta of the discourses, indicates that the author was writing down his material from memory, not from documentary sources.[25] In support of his position Noack also adduces evidence involving the evangelist's use of the Old Testament.[26] He shows that John usually quotes the Old Testament inexactly, thereby giving the impression that he is drawing upon his memory rather than copying a text. His quotations as a whole cannot be traced to any single Old Testament text nor explained as variants of Old Testament passages in the synoptics. (Had they been taken from a testimony source designed for polemical use against the Jews, they would have doubtless adhered more faithfully to some known text.) On the other hand, since no *Tendenz* can be observed in the quotations it is unlikely that they were deliberately altered. According to Noack, the evidence indicates that John quotes the Old Testament from memory. If this is really the case, he would scarcely have been more meticulous in his use of other sources, if he had any at all. The difficulties thus raised for source criticism are obvious.[27]

21. Schnackenburg's source is found in vv. 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 16 (ibid., pp. 81, 85ff.). Bultmann's includes at least parts of vv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16.

22. Noack, pp. 18–34.

23. Ibid., pp. 31ff.

24. Ibid., pp. 112–14.

25. Ibid., p. 124.

26. Ibid., pp. 71–89.

27. Coincidentally with the publication of Noack's book, and quite independently of it, C. Goodwin published an article in which he made a similar investigation of the Johannine Old Testament quotations and arrived at essentially the same conclusions ("How Did John Treat His Sources?" *JBL* 73 [1954]: 61–75). According to Goodwin, John quoted the Old Testament from memory, and therefore probably would not have scrupulously copied other sources. If this is the case, the possibility of recovering such sources as he may have drawn upon is rather slim.

Bultmann lost no time in replying to Noack.[28] In a review of his book Bultmann firmly rejects as self-evidently impossible Noack's attempt to break the Johannine text into small fragments wherever possible and trace their origin to oral tradition. The Johannine material obviously cannot be handled in this way. The evidence that the evangelist quoted the Old Testament from memory and did not use the synoptic gospels is valid, but it does not prove that he did not use other sources. (In his commentary Bultmann had already minimized and all but denied the evangelist's use of the synoptics.) Bultmann protests that while Noack tests his criteria in isolation from one another, he himself always uses them together so that they offer mutual support and confirmation. He also continues to insist that the overlapping of stylistic characteristics of different strata can be explained as the result of the evangelist's having annotated and imitated his sources. It is, however, certainly arguable that the evidence of the Old Testament quotations cannot be dismissed as of no significance for the source question. Moreover, continual recourse to the explanation of annotation and imitation only shows how well integrated any hypothetical sources must be, and therefore how difficult the task of source criticism is.

But if there was any remaining doubt about Bultmann's continued adherence to his source theory, it was dispelled with his publication in 1956 of the late Hans Becker's dissertation on the revelation discourses.[29] Indeed, in the foreword he explicitly states that the appearance of such books as those of Hoskyns, Wikenhauser, Barrett, Dodd, and Noack (all of which reject or ignore his source theory) by no means makes Becker's work superfluous. Becker, who studied under Bultmann, attempts to support his teacher's proposed *Offenbarungsreden* source by systematically adducing evidence from ancient Gnostic and quasi-Gnostic literature. In the Mandaean literature, the Odes of Solomon, the Pseudo-Clementines, etc., Becker discovers a common revelation discourse pattern, which he finds

28. "Zur johanneischen Tradition," *TLZ* (1955): 521–26.

29. *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsreden,* FRLANT, ed. R. Bultmann, n.s. 50, entire ser. 68; (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956). In addition, note Bultmann's review of C. H. Dodd's book, "The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 1 (1954–55): 77–91; also his article "Johannesevangelium," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, III* ed. K. Galling, et al., 3d ed. rev. (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1959), 840–50.

also in the Gospel of John. He believes that the existence of this common pattern in John and other ancient documents confirms the hypothesis of a revelation-discourse source underlying the Gospel. On the basis of his *religionsgeschichtliche* investigations he proceeds to isolate this source in John. With minor deviations the source he produces coincides to an amazing degree with Bultmann's *Offenbarungsreden*. That Becker shows the strong affinities of the Johannine discourses with a type of Gnostic revelation discourse is clear enough. What is not really clear is that this proves the existence of a Johannine discourse source which the evangelist copied out. Could not the evangelist himself have composed the discourses of the Gospel? This possibility is, or so it seems, very difficult to deny in view of the affinities with Gnosticism and other ancient ways of thinking which Bultmann and others readily affirm.[30]

Not all Bultmann's students, however, have been disposed to defend his views. One of the most significant criticisms of Bultmann's source hypothesis has arisen within the circle of his own pupils. It is based on theological considerations; but the theological considerations involved are historical and exegetical. That is, they have to do with the fundamental intention and theological perspective of the evangelist himself. Ernst Käsemann, who has brought these con-

30. Becker's thesis involves a very controversial aspect of Bultmann's treatment of John—and indeed, the entire development of New Testament theology—namely, his understanding of its relation to Gnosticism. Becker, like Bultmann, and others, believes that although most of the extant Gnostic documents assumed their present form after the emergence of Christianity, Gnosticism itself, including the Gnostic doctrine or myth of the redeemer, is a pre-Christian phenomenon. The revelation discourses of John are the product of such a pre-Christian Gnosticism. Although scholars such as F. C. Burkitt, R. P. Casey, and C. H. Dodd, to mention only a few, have rejected the theory of a pre-Christian Gnosticism, it is still widely held and there is yet no real consensus on the Gnostic problem. Thus the theory of the evangelist's use of a collection of such revelation discourses may not be rejected out of hand on the grounds that no pre-Christian Gnosticism, and specifically no Gnostic redeemer myth, ever existed. Fortunately, discussion of the question of the sources of John does not have to await the final solution of the Gnostic problem. While the refutation of the theory of a pre-Christian Gnosticism might preclude the kind of source which Bultmann proposes, it would not necessarily eliminate altogether the possibility of a discourse source. At the same time, not even the conclusive proof of a Gnostic redeemer myth, of a characteristic revelation discourse style, or of the existence of such a style in John would necessarily mean that the evangelist used a discourse source in the composition of his gospel.

sideration to light, first questioned the necessity of the source theory in a review of the commentary published soon after World War II.[31] In later articles he expressed doubt that a Christian evangelist would have relied so heavily on a Gnostic document such as the *Offenbarungsreden* and criticized Bultmann's identification of a discourse source, closely related to the Gospel source, in 1 John.[32] Subsequently, in an important study of the prologue he has raised questions about the theology of John which threaten to undermine the source theory by denying the assumption upon which it is based.[33]

Käsemann's analysis of the prologue is not completely unlike Bultmann's. He thinks that the evangelist used an earlier Christian hymn as its basis, but not a pre-Christian Gnostic Hymn, as Bultmann supposes. While Bultmann identified the *Vorlage* in vv. 1, 2(?)–5, 9–12, 14, 16, Käsemann finds it only in 1 (2?)–5, 10–12.[34] Most important, he assigns vv. 14–18 without exception to the evangelist. Reiterating his earlier reservations about the possibility of satisfactorily showing the connection between the rhythmic *Vorlage* of the prologue and Bultmann's hypothetical discourse source extending throughout the Gospel, Käsemann points out that even in the prologue one can hardly discern the same rhythmic structure in vv. 14–18 which is found in the earlier portion. Moreover, in v. 14 there is a significant transition from the third person to the confessional first person singular. In developing and applying the rhythm criterion Bultmann relies to a considerable extent upon the conjectured Aramaic origin of the prologue source, a hypothesis which at one or two points gets him out of serious difficulty. In Käsemann's judgment, however, this hypothesis is not well enough established to play a fundamental role in the analysis of the prologue and to serve as the basis for other theories. He regards as

31. "Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes," *Verkündigung und Forschung, Theologischer Jahresbericht,* 3 (1942–46): 182–201.

32. "Ketzer und Zeuge, Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem," *ZTK*, 48 (1951): esp. p. 306 n. 2; also "Neutestamentliche Fragen von Heute," *ZTK* 54 (1957), 15–16.

33. "Aufbau und Anliegen des johanneischen Prologs," *Libertas Christiana, Friedrich Delekat zum 65. Geburtstag,* ed. E. Wolf and W. Matthias (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1957), pp. 75–99.

34. Ibid., pp. 85ff.

especially questionable the use of the conjectured Aramaic original to rescue the rhythm of the source.[35]

Most important, however, is Käsemann's criticism of Bultmann's interpretation of 1:14, which he (against Bultmann) assigns to the evangelist. Whereas Bultmann, along with many earlier exegetes and a long tradition of Christian theological interpretation, has seen the point of emphasis in the καὶ ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο, Käsemann asserts that this is merely the necessary presupposition of the ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. Bultmann, taking his cue from the ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, understands the Fourth Gospel as the gospel of the revelation of the Word in the man Jesus and renders a Kierkegaardian interpretation of the incarnation as the incognito of the revealer. From the perspective proposed by Käsemann, however, Bultmann has thus obscured the *Leitmotiv* of the Gospel, namely, the glorious character of the incarnation as the presence and activity of God upon earth in the person of Jesus.[36]

This view of the Christology of the Gospel, which is really the obverse of Bultmann's, has some important implications for source criticism. Bultmann's source analysis enables him to assign the cruder mythological and miraculous elements of the Gospel to the speech and sign sources, which the evangelist is supposed to have used in a very artful way, employing their language, narrative, or imagery so as to express his own more sophisticated point of view. This disposition of the miraculous and mythical elements, which puts a certain distance between their original meaning and the use to which they are put in the Gospel, is precisely what is demanded if Bultmann's theological interpretation is to stand.[37] But the effect

35. Ibid., p. 78; cf. "Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes," p. 188. In fairness to Bultmann it should be noted that in the most recent comprehensive investigation of the problem of Aramaisms in the New Testament Matthew Black concludes that Aramaic sources or traditions probably underlie the prologue, the Baptist sayings in chap. 3, and, most important, many of the sayings of Jesus (*An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 2nd ed. rev. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954], pp. 207–9). While this confirms the plausibility of Bultmann's speech source proposal, it does not go very far toward demonstrating the validity of the *Offenbarungsreden* theory in the form in which he presents it.

36. *Libertas Christiana*, pp. 90–94.

37. *ZTK* 57 (1957): 15–16: "Bultmanns Deutung, mit der ich mich hier allein befasse, steht und fällt mit der Theorie, dass der Evangelist eine heidnische Quelle von Offenbarungsreden benutzt, überarbeitet und kommentiert habe und sich

of Käsemann's interpretation of the prologue, especially v.14, is to remove the inner theological justification and motivation of the source theory. Given Käsemann's understanding of the evangelist's perspective, the source theory, which for Bultmann was a key to the proper understanding of the Gospel, becomes superfluous. If the evangelist's thought followed the lines laid down by Käsemann, he could easily have composed the speeches of Jesus in the Gospel as the definitive expression of his Christology. It would not then be necessary to suppose that he adopted a document whose conceptions he took seriously but not literally. The hypothesis of a *semeia*-source, or something like it, is perhaps not quite so seriously affected. In Bultmann's commentary it may seem to serve the purpose of putting some distance between the evangelist and the boldly miraculous elements of the Gospel (and allow him to assign a less sophisticated understanding of *semeia* to pre-gospel tradition), yet it is not to be discounted for that reason alone. The evangelist obviously got his narrative tradition from somewhere, and he could have employed such a document, believing the events recounted to be necessarily historical and at the same time using them for his own theological purposes. This is, in fact, the way in which Käsemann suggests that John handled the miracle stories.[38] While there may be alternative explanations of the narrative material in John the *semeia*-source proposal is surely not implausible.

Käsemann's far-reaching objection to Bultmann's understanding of the Fourth Gospel and its implications for the source question, together with the more specific and technical criticisms advanced by Ruckstuhl and Noack, have brought to light the difficulties involved in Bultmann's elaborate source theory. By attacking the stylistic grounds of the theory Ruckstuhl and Noack have con-

gleichzeitig einer Zeichenquelle bediene, um mit Wundern die Gabe und den Anspruch des Offenbarers zu illustrieren. Nur so kann Bultmann sowohl das unbestreitbar im Evangelium vorliegende mythologische Gut wie den krassen Mirakelglauben vom Evangelisten distanzieren. Nur so kann er daran festhalten, dass die Fleischwerdung des Wortes das Thema des Evangeliums sei, im Sinne Kierkegaards die Fleischwerdung das Inkognito des Offenbarers wahren und mit diesem Inkognito das Ärgernis der Welt erregen lassen."

38. Cf. also E. Haenchen, "Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat," *NTS* 9 (1962–63): 208–16.

firmed what Schweizer had already indicated, namely, the extreme difficulty of separating extensive sources with any degree of certainty on account of the pervasive stylistic unity of the present form of the Gospel. By questioning Bultmann's conception of the theology of the evangelist and his sophistication, Käsemann has really asked whether the source theory is a necessity or whether it is the modern exegete's way of quite unconsciously discovering a theological brother under the skin in the ancient writer. Bultmann's admiration for the Fourth Gospel and his extensive appropriation of its message as he understands it in the development of his own theological position do not need to be described here. It is worth pointing out, however, that Bultmann's interpretation of John is closely related to his theory about the evangelist's method of composition, particularly his use of sources. The source theory is in this respect really much more important than the assignment of certain passages (e.g. 5: 28–29 and 6:51c–58) to the ecclesiastical redactor. The existence of this redactor, who absorbs those passages which are embarrassingly inconsistent with the main theological thrust of the Gopel, becomes credible only if the evangelist himself is conceived as the kind of subtle, sophisticated, and consistent theological thinker Bultmann believes him to be, and this conception of the evangelist is developed by Bultmann in his commentary along with the source theory. As Käsemann has so astutely discerned, the source theory and Bultmann's interpretation of the evangelist's theology go hand in hand. Only when this interpretation is established can it be convincingly claimed that such-and-such an idea or statement is impossible for the evangelist and therefore should be assigned to the redactor.

TWO RECENT INVESTIGATIONS OF THE PROBLEMS OF JOHANNINE ORIGINS

Rightly or wrongly, the most recent investigations of problems pertaining to the origin and composition of the Fourth Gospel have rejected Bultmann's elaborate source theory, have demurred at accepting it, or have ignored it completely. Perhaps one reason for this state of affairs is the relative inaccessibility of much of his argumentation in the footnotes of the commentary. Also Noack and Ruckstuhl are frequently cited as having disproved the source

theory,[39] but at least Bultmann himself has not conceded that this is the case.

In fact the work of two younger scholars shows that Bultmann's proposals and the subsequent discussion have not been without their effect. W. Wilkens and S. Schulz set out in very different directions in their recent monographs and articles, but both take cognizance of the evidence which has led Bultmann and others to propose source theories to explain the origin and composition of the Fourth Gospel. Wilkens argues on the basis of intense literary criticism that in the process of transforming the document from a rather simple *Urevangelium* (Wellhausen) into what he describes as a passion gospel, the evangelist wrote or rewrote it three times.[40] The traces of an editing or reworking of the Gospel have led some scholars to propose sources or a *Grundschrift;* the stylistic unity of the Gospel has led others to deny such proposals. Now Wilkens presents a theory which attempts to account for both phenomena. According to him the evangelist, so to speak, wrote his own sources. Interestingly enough, portions of sources which Bultmann isolated (e.g. the "*Lichtrede*" discourse from the *Offenbarungsreden*) sometimes turn up as separate literary units in the intermediate stage of Wilken's revisions of the Gospel. That Wilkens' theory is as ingenious as it is elaborate cannot be denied. Yet it stumbles over its own elaborateness and ingenuity.[41] One can scarcely believe that an author's successive revisions of his work could be successfully reconstructed in the detail which Wilkens attempts. But in view of

39. P. Niewalda, *Sakramentssymbolik im Johannesevangelium? Eine exegetisch-historische Studie* (Limburg: Lahn Verlag, 1958), p. 2; J.A.T. Robinson, "The New Look on the Fourth Gospel," *Studia Evangelica*, Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957, ed. K. Aland, et al. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), p. 341; F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne*, EBib (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda et Cie., 1959) pp. 11; P. Parker, "Two Editions of John," *JBL* 12 (1956): 304; S. Mendner, "Johanneische Literarkritik," *ThZ* 8 (1952): 422; E. Haenchen, "Johanneische Probleme," *ZTK* 56 (1959): p. 53 n. 2.

40. *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums* (Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1958).

41. Cf. J. M. Robinson, "Recent Research in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 78 (1959): 242ff.; C. K. Barrett, "Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums," *TLZ* 84 (1959): 828–29f.

the acknowledged literary unity of the Gospel the suggestion that the present text of the Fourth Gospel is the result of the author's own revising and editing is not impossible. Wilkens himself has shown that the removal of seemingly secondary elements from a passage cannot be counted on to produce a non-Johannine core.[42] Even where one is able to separate tradition and redaction, he finds "Johannine" elements in each. Whether this indicates a unity of authorship or only a development within a school or circle of tradition and interpretation is, however, a question worth asking. If Wilkens has perhaps overdeveloped and overstated his case in this initial monograph, the line which he is pursuing certainly merits consideration.

In contrast to Wilkens, Schulz has given up literary criticism—along with numerous other methods which he identifies and describes extensively and in detail—as a primary means of investigating the text of John in favor of a combination of *Traditionsgeschichte* and *Religionsgeschichte* methods which he calls *Themageschichte*. Schulz intends to look behind the text of the Gospel for earlier traditions centering in specific themes. In an initial monograph[43] he attempted to recover the Son of Man and related traditions of the Gospel, which, when isolated, he traced to Jewish apocalyptic origins. Much of the material which Bultmann assigned to the redactor because of its futuristic eschatology (e.g. 5:28–29) Schulz now ascribes to primitive tradition. In a second study[44] Schulz deals with the prologue and the predicative *ego eimi* sayings with their related images (shepherd, vine, etc.). By means of a variety of methods he seeks to isolate the traditional units and relate them to their proper background in the religious landscape from which Christianity emerged, principally in the Jewish sectarian and Mandaean Gnostic groups of first-century Palestine and neighborhood. Frequently he finds that originally Jewish traditions have undergone what he calls Gnostic reinterpretation before being incorporated into the Gospel. Sometimes even the

42. "Die Erweckung des Lazarus," *ThZ* 15 (1959): 23–39.

43. *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium, Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Methodengeschichte der Auslegung des 4. Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

44. *Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden*, BWANT, ed. K. H. Rengstorf and L. Rost, 5th ser. 1, entire ser. 81; (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1960).

ultimate origin of a tradition or concept (e.g. the logos title) is said to be Gnostic.

Although in contrast to Bultmann, and perhaps in opposition to him, Schulz abjures the quest for literary sources extending through all or most of the Gospel, his own ambitions are obviously far from modest and his goals hard to achieve. The lines between tradition, later interpretation, and the evangelist's own work are difficult to draw with any degree of objectivity, and when one has isolated a traditional segment with some degree of certainty he may not even then be sure of its provenance. The latter problem is all the more acute in view of the extensive mixing of religious ideas and themes of various origins which was evidently characteristic of later antiquity. Nevertheless, Schulz's research is highly suggestive in that it points so clearly to the possibility that the stuff of the Johannine literature had a long—perhaps preliterary and pre-Christian—history before taking the form in which we find it in the Fourth Gospel. In principle Schulz's work does not necessarily conflict with that of Wilkens or Bultmann, inasmuch as he purports to deal with an earlier stage of the Gospel's development. In fact, however, it does, for often the explanations offered by Schulz make those advanced by Wilkens and Bultmann superfluous.

A FEW EMERGING POINTS OF AGREEMENT?

Departing from Bultmann, Johannine research, as exemplified by the work of Wilkens and Schulz, is finding new directions and producing new theories. While it may be presumptuous to regard Bultmann's proposals as moribund, they do not in fact constitute a widely accepted hypothesis on the basis of which present and future research may proceed. The study of the Fourth Gospel is not, however, advanced by the recognition of serious and well-founded objections to Bultmann's source theory. Certainly if such a literary theory could have been adequately established it would have been a great boon to Johannine study, which is now plagued with a morass of conflicting views. One can well agree with J.A.T. Robinson's observation that "the effect of reading too much on the Fourth Gospel is to make one feel either that everything has been said about it that could conceivably be said or that it really does not matter what one says, for one is just as likely to be right as

anyone else."[45] But perhaps even now it is possible to discern certain trends, if not agreements, in Johannine study which indicate that we are about to move from a state of chaos toward a measure of consensus. While it cannot be claimed that Bultmann's work on the source problem has exercised a determinative influence, the extent to which some of his general perspectives, if not his detailed hypothesis, are represented in such agreement as is now emerging is remarkable.

There is, in the first place, the question of the relationship of John and the synoptic gospels. Scholars such as Wilkens and Noack, as much as they may differ with Bultmann (and each other), would agree that John did not use the synoptic gospels as his narrative source, if indeed he knew them at all. And while E. Haenchen has recently indicated disagreement with Noack, Wilkens, and Bultmann, he has nevertheless also argued that John did not draw his narrative material from the synoptics.[46] As a matter of fact, the view that John did not use the synoptics had already been set forth in England by P. Gardner-Smith (1938) and in America by E. R. Goodenough (1945).[47] C. H. Dodd voiced his substantial agreement with Gardner-Smith in his magnum opus,[48] and although C. K. Barrett still believes that John knew at least Mark and perhaps Luke, he readily grants that we cannot speak of these as his sources.[49]

45. "The Relation of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John," *NTS* 9 (1962–63): 120.

46. "Johanneische Probleme," *ZTK* 56 (1959): 19–54. Wilkens, in his turn, has now objected to Haenchen's contention that the Johannine narrative material comes from a literary source which can be shown to be later than the synoptics ("Evangelist und Tradition im Johannesevangelium," *ThZ* 16 [1960]: 81–90). Wilkens insists that although the evangelist used tradition, he so thoroughly assimilated it as to preclude an analysis like Haenchen's, which proceeds by distinguishing exactly between non-Johannine source and Johannine embellishment.

47. P. Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938); E. R. Goodenough, "John a Primitive Gospel," *JBL* 64 (1945): 145–82, esp. 150–60, 169–70.

48. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 419.

49. Barrett, *St. John*, p. 34. John A. Bailey has also recently maintained that John knew Luke (as well as Mark), but he does not believe the amount of actual dependence was very great (*The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*, NovTSup 7 [Leiden: Brill, 1963]).

Moreover, it is worth noting that although he might have thereby sustained his own view of John's purpose and method, E. C. Hoskyns in his commentary prudently refrained from claiming that John knew the synoptics in their present form.[50] Among those who deny that John used the synoptics there is substantial agreement that he drew his narratives from a tradition having some points of contact with the synoptic tradition. At this point, however, opinion diverges sharply. Although many would accept Bultmann's proposed passion source or something like it, his *semeia*-source (accounting for most of the narrative material in chaps. 1–12) has not been accorded wide acceptance. For example, Noack and Dodd believe instead that the tradition was entirely or largely oral, while Haenchen thinks that it came to the evangelist in the form of an *Urevangelium*.[51]

As for the discourses, Bultmann and Becker have apparently not succeeded in attracting others to their hypothesis of a source of Gnostic *Offenbarungsreden*, although Schnackenburg and Barrett have spoken of homilies later incorporated into the Gospel,[52] and many have thought that the prologue is based on a hymn or written source. Nevertheless, the special and kerygmatic character of the discourses—indeed of the whole Gospel—is widely acknowledged. In a variety of recent studies and interpretations the common factor is the conclusion or assumption that the discourses incorporate the Johannine preaching, whatever their relation to tradition and history may be.[53] Thus while Bultmann's discourse source may be

50. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel,* ed. F. N. Davey, 2d ed. rev. (London: Faber & Faber, 1947), p. 82.

51. G. Ziener ("Johannesevangelium und urchristliche Passafeier," *BZ* 2 [1958]: 263–74) thinks the narrative source of John is a Jewish Passover haggada which also underlies Wis. 10:1–19:22, and R. H. Smith believes the Johannine narratives are a typological development of Exod. 2: 23–12: 51 ("Exodus Typology in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 81 [1962]: 329–42).

52. Schnackenburg, "Die 'situationsgelösten' Redestücke in Joh. 3," *ZNW* 49 (1958): 88–99; Barrett, *St. John*, p. 17.

53. Bultmann believes that the discourses are grounded upon—and even take as their texts—the segments of the *Offenbarungsreden*; thus the Gnostic source becomes the seedbed for the Christian proclamation of the gospel. Cullmann, quite in opposition to Bultmann, thinks that the Gospel is largely a cult-oriented exposition "which treats the two sacraments as expressions of the whole worship life of the early community and correspondingly sets forth the relation between

rejected in the form in which he proposed it, his (and Becker's) observations regarding the character and genre of the Johannine *Reden* are by no means to be set aside as worthless. Future studies of the nature and background of the Johannine preaching can scarcely afford to neglect them.

Finally, the discovery of the Qumran scrolls has led many scholars to see in them and the sectarian Judaism from which they emerged the proper milieu of the Fourth Gospel. This in turn has led to the recent widespread rejection of the once commonly held view that John is the gospel of the Hellenists. It should be remembered, however, that the scrolls by no means invalidate Bultmann's general

the Lord of the community *present especially in the two sacraments and the life of Jesus*" (*Early Christian Worship,* trans. A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance; SBT 10 [London: S.C.M., 1953], p. 58). Bultmann has, of course, denied that the evangelist was interested in sacraments and has ascribed the references to them to the redactor. His former student, H. Köster, does not follow Bultmann exactly on this point, but maintains that the evangelist sometimes deliberately used sacramental language to emphasize the historicity of the Christ-event (cf. "Geschichte und Kultus im Johannesevangelium und bei Ignatius von Antiochen," *ZTK* 54 [1957]: 56–69). Wilkens, on the other hand, adopts Cullmann's sacramental interpretation, but also emphasizes in a more general way the kerygmatic nature of the Gospel. While maintaining the early and ultimately apostolic origin of the Gospel, he denies its historicity, claiming that it is rather preaching. The origin of this preaching is the spirit-inspired word of the authoritative witness speaking for the exalted Lord in the worshiping community (Wilkens, *Enstehungsgeschichte,* p. 169). Similarly, in a recent monograph on the Beloved Disciple, Alv Kragerud has argued that the Gospel originated in a circle of Christian charismatic prophets and is intented to assert the authority of the spirit-inspired prophet, represented by the Beloved Disciple, over against the growing power of the institutional ministry, represented by Peter (*Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium, Ein exegetischer Versuch* [Oslo: Osloer Universitätsverlag, 1959]). Of late Käsemann has suggested that he also thinks the roots of the Johannine preaching are to be sought in early Christian prophecy ("Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," *ZTK* 57 [1960]: 176). But A. Guilding in her ingenious and erudite book treats the whole Gospel as a kind of exposition of the Old Testament texts of an ancient Jewish lectionary system, especially the texts associated with the great feasts (*The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship, A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960]). For her the Gospel is a Christian recapitulation of the Jewish system of worship. Another much more modest effort to relate John to Jewish worship is B. Gärtner's *John 6 and the Jewish Passover,* ConNT 17 (Gleerup and Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959).

view of the origin of the Gospel of John. For while he views it as a Hellenistic document in the general sense in which all New Testament books are Hellenistic, he does full justice to its Semitic and even Jewish ancestry. The discourse source, while a product of Gnosticism, does not stem from Western, pagan Gnostic circles, but from a Semitic milieu, in which Jewish influences are quite strong—indeed, from the John the Baptist sect,[54] which is now often said to stand in close relation both to Qumran and to the Johannine tradition. Before the discovery of the scrolls and fifteen years before the publication of his commentary, Bultmann suggested a Semitic and even Palestinian origin of the Johannine material.[55] In the commentary he traces the *Offenbarungsreden*, which contain the basic Johannine theological conceptuality, to very much the kind of religious milieu and geographic locus which produced the Qumran scrolls.

So it is now possible to speak of a loose, but real, consensus regarding a Johannine tradition relatively independent of the synoptics, a typically Johannine preaching (found especially in the discourses of the Gospel and in the First Epistle), and the fundamentally Semitic and even Jewish character and background of this tradition and preaching. Whatever legitimate criticisms may be made of Bultmann's source theory, it is significant that in its own peculiar way it takes cognizance of all three of these factors. This is but one reason why his commentary remains a landmark in the history of Johannine study to which others will, or should, repeatedly turn for fresh stimulus, insight, and perspective on Johannine problems.[56]

54. *Johannes*, pp. 4–5, 14–15. cf. pp. 29, 76.

55. *ZNW* 24 (1925): 100–46. Note esp. pp. 142ff.

56. In dealing even with recent exegetical investigations, we have not been able to make a comprehensive presentation. Other scholars who have recently dealt with the source problem include S. Mendner, whose basic position is set forth in "Johanneische Literarkritik," *ThZ* 8 (1952): 418–34; S. Temple, "A Key to the Composition of the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 80 (1961): 220–32, and "The Two Signs in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 81 (1962): 169–74; M. E. Boismard, "L'évolution du thème eschatologique dans les traditions johanniques," *RB* 68 (1961): 507–25; H. M., Teeple, "Methodology in Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 81 (1962): 279–86. In the last couple of years two more extensive treatments of the problem of the sources and composition of the Fourth Gospel have appeared in Germany: K. A. Eckhardt, *Der Tod des Johannes als Schlüssel zum Verständnis der johanneischen Schriften*, Studien zur Rechts- und Religionsgeschichte 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961); W. Hartke, *Vier urchristliche Partien und ihre Vereinigung zur apostolischen Kirche*, vol. 1: *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft 24 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961). It is, of course, impossible to describe these books here. Both are impressive and erudite works which contain some valuable insights, but there is an element of what I can only call the fantastic in each of them. Suffice it to say that Eckhardt thinks that the original Gospel was written by John the son of Zebedee, the disciple whom Jesus loved and whom he raised from the dead ("Lazarus" is a later editorial fiction borrowed from Luke). His book was then revised by Ignatius of Antioch and translated from Aramaic to Greek by John the Elder at the turn of the century. Interpolations were later added by Papias! Hartke distinguishes first a *Grundschrift Z* (not unlike Bultmann's *semeia*-source!). The subsequent editing of this document by *V* produced a proto-John which was never published. Then came the final reworking by *H*, who published the Gospel in its present form. (The Johannine epistles are the work of only *V* and *H*, while *H* alone is responsible for the Apocalypse.) Hartke goes to great trouble to separate these three layers in John and to identify the persons responsible for each, concluding that *Z* is John the son of Zebedee, *V* is John Mark, and *H* is Judas Barsabbas!

Probably the best recent bibliography is to be found in Kümmel's revision of the Feine–Behm *Einleitung*, pp. 126–29.